

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS (RFP 07-03)

Questions & Answers posted on 03-20-07

(Updated 03-23-07, beginning with No. 6)

1. When INDOT first went to the LOI format in the fall of 2005, the RFP stated that the LOI needed to be pt. 12 Times New Roman font with one inch margins all around. Do the LOI's still need to be formatted in that way or is it at our discretion?

Response: The criteria you mentioned is no longer required. However, the font needs to be large enough that the documents can be easily read.

2. We are wondering whether *Item No. 03 Development of a new Bridge Inspection Data Base / Data Application System* in RFP0701 will be reissued, and we would appreciate some information on the schedule. Also, is there a contact person for this project that we could speak to before the RFP is released?

Response: We anticipate re-advertising the referenced item in about a month. If you have specific questions concerning this item, please e-mail them to ContractsRFP@indot.in.gov and a response will be e-mailed to your attention. (And posted on the web)

3. We are puzzled by the identification of prequalification area 5.12 Karst Studies under item 4 Added Travel Lanes Marion and Hancock Co. Please clarify.

Response: 5.12 Karst Studies is not applicable for the referenced item and the advertisement on the web will be revised.

4. The Engineer's Report for the US 27 Road Reconstruction is missing pages 2, 4, 6, 8, & 10. Can we have access to these pages?

Response: Once I receive a copy of the complete report, I'll have it posted on the web and ask that an e-mail be sent via the ListServ.

5. Item No 4: Added Travel Lanes on I-70 in Marion and Hancock Counties The request contains the following: "A separate consultant should be secured to provide and independent review of any right of way plan development." Should this consultant be identified by name in our LOI with a corresponding percentage of the project anticipated for assignment?

Response: Yes. All consultants that will be secured as sub-consultants should be listed in the LOI with a corresponding percentage of the project anticipated for assignment.

6. When you print the LOI's, are they in color or black & white?

Response: The LOIs are viewed electronically, as well as printed in black & white and sometimes color. However, it is not a requirement for the LOI to be submitted in color.

7. Can you please post (or email me) the full Decision Brief for Item 11? Only the first page of the brief is posted at this time. The remaining pages of the brief provide details that will be very useful when drafting our proposal.

Response: The file has been updated and posted on the web, under "Additional Information", for both items 11 and 12.

8. Item 4 indicates work to be assigned includes the preparation of real estate services and right of way acquisition. The Engineer's Reports for both 0200699 and 0200700 indicate no right of way is to be taken because the lane additions are on the median side. Would categories 11.1, 12.1, 12.2 12.3, 12.4, 12.5, 12.6 and 12. 8 really be required for this project?

Response: The Engineers' Reports are considered "draft" reports as of now. The selected consultant will need to coordinate with the INDOT Feasibility Section to verify the proposed scope. The possibility of widening along outside of the roadway may be considered. Real Estate Services have been removed from the Prequalification requirements. However, if it is determined that additional R/W is needed, the selected firm will be required to have the Real Estate Services performed by an INDOT prequalified firm.

9. Item 4: Based on this being an added travel lanes project in the median of an existing highway, we do not understand the need for items 5.3, 5.4, 5.5, 5.9, 5.10 and 5.11. Please clarify why these items would be needed.

Response: Some of the Environmental Prequalification requirements have been removed. However, if it is determined that additional Environmental Services or a higher level of Environmental is needed, the selected firm will be required to have those Services performed by an INDOT prequalified firm.

10. Item 4 directs to only design and I would expect only construct the first 5.18 miles of this project. The Engineer's Report for Des. 0200699 shows a construction cost of \$35,870,000 for the first 5.18 miles while RFP 07-03 item 4 indicates the construction cost to be \$62,339,515 for a difference of \$26,469,515? If you add the construction costs from the Engineer's Reports for Des. 0200699 and 0200700 you get: \$35,870,000. + \$54,068,000. = \$ 89,938,000. which also is not close to the construction cost of \$62,339,515. as shown for item 4. Please clarify the construction cost and limits of project construction.

Response: Unfortunately, the construction costs shown in the Engineers' Reports do not account for certain items. Since the time these reports were published, many items (such as utilities) that used to be accounted for using other funding sources now must be accounted for in the construction costs. Also, the costs shown are in 2005 dollars, while the construction costs in the RFP are in construction year dollars (2013-2014). For clarification, the budgeted construction costs per "Major Moves" are as follows: 0200699 is budgeted for \$62,339,515; 0200700 is budgeted for \$71,012,290. While the scope verification and environmental documentation will be provided for the entire corridor, the selected consultant for this RFP will be responsible for the design of 0200699 only.

11. Item 4 (I-70) list prequalifications required for 3.2 traffic capacity analysis - there are no interchanges to be designed as a part of this work and the Engineers' Report is complete - can you explain the work required?

Response: The Engineers' Reports are considered "draft" reports as of now. The selected consultant will need to coordinate with the INDOT Feasibility Section to verify the proposed scope. As such, some traffic capacity analysis may be required.

12. Item 4 (I-70) list prequalifications required for 5.1 EA/EIS and 5.2 CE - do you know the anticipated level of document required?

Response: It is anticipated that the environmental documentation level will be a CE. The level of the CE (1 through 4) is not certain at this time, but it is likely to be a CE Level 3 or 4.

13. Item 2 (US33) project description is only for the 1st segment, but the construction cost is for the entire 3 segments: Is design for 1 or all 3? The project description is only for the 1st segment, but is environmental document for the entire project? Will peripheral alternate routes, off alignment, be needed to be investigated in detail in the environmental document?

Response: The intention of this RFP is to include all three segments (Des# 9222424, 9222425, 9222426) in single contract. The work might encompass the design, environmental, r/w activities, utility coordination and pick-up survey for all three segments. In terms of preparation of environmental document, we might need to investigate the alternatives based on the environmental impact this project might have.

14. For Item # 2 (US 33 added travel lanes), please confirm the need for work category 9.2 (Level 2 Bridge Design). I see no bridges within the project limits.

- a) Response: The reason for the inclusion of level 2 bridge design is that we might need to assess the possibility of overpass over railroad at 9th street. The Prequalification for the Level 2 Bridge Design has been removed from the RFP advertisement. However, if it is determined that this is needed in the future, the selected firm will be required to have the Real Estate Services performed by an INDOT prequalified firm.